



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/823,972

04/03/2001

Michael Golan

T03/1

9678

7590

07/15/2004

DR. D. GRAESER
C/O THE POLKINGHORNS
9003 FLORIN WAY
UPPER MARLBORO, MD 20772

EXAMINER

SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/823,972	Applicant(s) GOLAN, MICHAEL	
	Examiner Mohammad A Siddiqi	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04/03/2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1-3, 14-17, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rollins et al. (6,434,601) (hereinafter Rollins).

4. As per claim 1, Rollins discloses method for correcting a transmitted message by a transmitting user, the method comprising:

correcting the transmitted message by the transmitting to form a corrected message (col 4, lines 9-21);

transmitting the corrected message to the recipient (col 4, lines 9-21);

and

replacing the transmitted message with the corrected message (ping, col 4, lines 9-21).

5. As per claim 2, Rollins discloses wherein the transmitted message and the corrected message are both e-mail messages (col 4, lines 9-21).

6. As per claim 3, Rollins discloses wherein the transmitted message is replaced with the corrected message at the recipient (to: field, col 4, lines 9-21).

7. As per claim 14, Rollins discloses system for correcting a transmitted e-mail message by a transmitting user, the system comprising:

(a) an e-mail software program for transmitting the transmitted e-mail message (fig 2, col 3, lines 55-64);

(b) an e-mail server for receiving the transmitted e-mail message (fig 2, col 3, lines 55-64); and

(c) a correction module for correcting the transmitted e-mail message to form a corrected e-mail message, said corrected e-mail message being transmitted (col 4, lines 1-21) to said e-mail server (col 4, lines 15-20).

8. As per claim 15, Rollins discloses, (d) a transmitting device for operating said e-mail software program and said correction module (fig 2, col 3, lines 45-67); and

(e) a receiving device for receiving at least said corrected e-mail message from said e-mail server (fig 1-2, col 4, lines 9-21).

9. As per claim 16, Rollins discloses wherein said receiving device receives both the transmitted e-mail message and said corrected e-mail message (fig 1-2, col 4, lines 9-21).

10. As per claim 17, Rollins does not specifically discloses wherein said corrected e-mail message replaces the transmitted e-mail message. However, Davis discloses wherein said corrected e-mail message replaces the transmitted e-mail message (revisions, col 3, lines 1-25).

11. As per claim 20 further comprising: (d) a transmitting device for operating said e-mail software program and said correction module (fig 2, col 3, lines 45-67); and (e) a receiving device for receiving a message from said

e-mail server concerning said correction module, such that said receiving device can only receive said corrected message if said receiving device operates said correction module (fig 2, col 3, lines 45-67).

12. As per claim 22, Rollins discloses wherein said correction module is operated by said e-mail server (fig 1-2, col 4, lines 9-21).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 4-13, 18, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rollins et al. (6,434,601) (hereinafter Rollins) in view of Davis et al. (5,937,160) (hereinafter Davis).

15. As per claim 4, Rollins discloses wherein the transmitted message is received by a e-mail server (col 4, lines 9-21)

Rollins does not specifically disclose wherein the transmitted message is replaced with the corrected message as an attachment at said e-mail server.

However, Davis discloses wherein the transmitted message is replaced with the corrected message as an attachment (fig 6, col 9, line 4) at said e-mail server (revisions, col 3, lines 1-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Davis with Rollins because it would prevent the delivery of an email message having incorrect or undesirable information to the e-mail addressee's.

16. As per claim 5, Rollins does not specifically disclose wherein the transmitted message is replaced with the corrected message by adding the transmitted message as an attachment to the corrected message.

However, Davis discloses wherein the transmitted message is replaced with the corrected message by adding the transmitted message as an attachment (fig 6, col 9, line 4) to the corrected message (revisions, col 3, lines 1-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Davis with Rollins because it would prevent the delivery of an email message having incorrect or undesirable information to the e-mail addressee's.

17. As per claim 6, Rollins does not specifically disclose wherein the transmitted message is added to the corrected message at the recipient.

However, Davis discloses wherein the transmitted message is added to the corrected message at the recipient (col 2, lines 56-67, col 3, lines 1-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Davis with Rollins because it would prevent the delivery of an email message having incorrect or undesirable information to the e-mail addressee's.

18. As per claims 7 and 19, Rollins discloses wherein a plurality of corrected e-mail messages are sent (col 4, lines 1-33), such that a plurality of transmitted incorrect e-mail messages is formed (col 4, lines 1-33), Rollins, does not specifically discloses said plurality of transmitted incorrect e-mail messages being added to a final corrected e-mail message as nested attachments at the recipient.

However, Davis discloses plurality of transmitted incorrect e-mail messages being added to a final corrected e-mail message as nested attachments at the recipient (revisions, fig 6, col 2, lines 56-67, col 3, lines 1-35, col 9, line 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Davis with Rollins because it would prevent the delivery of an email message having incorrect or undesirable information to the e-mail addressee's.

19. As per claim 8, Rollins does not specifically disclose wherein the transmitted message is received by a e-mail server and wherein the transmitted message is added to the corrected message as an attachment at said e-mail server.

However, Davis discloses wherein the transmitted message is received by a e-mail server and wherein the transmitted message is added to the corrected message as an attachment at said e-mail server (col 2, lines 56-67, col 3, lines 1-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Davis with Rollins because it would prevent the delivery of an email message having incorrect or undesirable information to the e-mail addressee's.

20. As per claim 9, Rollins discloses wherein only the corrected message is displayed to the recipient (only correct message is sent, fig 2, col 4, lines 44-67 and col 5, lines 1-20).

21. As per claim 10, Rollins discloses wherein the corrected message is identical to the transmitted message, except for an additional recipient, such that an original recipient of the transmitted message only receives a

message concerning said additional message, and only said additional recipient receives the corrected message (col 4, lines 9-67).

22. As per claim 11, Rollins discloses wherein only a message indicating at least one specific correction is sent to the recipient as the corrected message (col 4, lines 9-67).

23. As per claims 12 and 21, Rollins does not specifically disclose wherein each transmitted message receives a unique identifying code for securely locating and correcting the transmitted message.

However, Davis discloses wherein each transmitted message receives a unique identifying code for securely locating and correcting the transmitted message (col 9, lines 1-18).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Davis with Rollins because it would prevent the delivery of an email message having incorrect or undesirable information to the e-mail addressee's.

24. As per claim 13, Rollins discloses wherein only the corrected message is displayed to the recipient (col 4, lines 9-67).

25. As per claim 18, Rollins does not specifically disclose wherein the transmitted e-mail message is added to said corrected e-mail message as an attachment.

However, Davis discloses wherein the transmitted e-mail message is added to said corrected e-mail message as an attachment (fig 6, col 3, lines 1-25, col 9, line 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Davis with Rollins because it would prevent the delivery of an email message having incorrect or undesirable information to the e-mail addressee's.

Conclusion

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S. Patent 6,460,074

U.S. Publication 2001/0055023 A1

U.S. Patent 6,0373,133

U.S. Patent 6,718,368

U.S. Patent 6,622,170

U.S. Patent 6,073,165

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A Siddiqi whose telephone number is (703) 305-0353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100